

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 have been rejected as anticipated by Huttenlocher. Claim 1, from which all of the other claims are ultimately dependent, has been amended to be patentably distinguishable from the reference.

Although Huttenlocher arguably discloses various of the steps recited in claim 1 as filed, such as determining bounding boxes and comparing data describing the input boxes to a reference image, etc., Huttenlocher addresses specific problems strictly involving optical character recognition of text. As stated at column 7, lines 51-53, the teaching of Huttenlocher *as a whole* relates to “determining, segmenting, and comparing **words** in terms of their **shapes**” (emphases added). Following the overview of the method in FIG. 2 of Huttenlocher, it is clear that the reference is strictly in the realm of being able to identify words within a single document or file, and substituting data from already-recognized words for words that cannot be recognized.

The claimed invention is directed to a different purpose. Instead of looking at shapes of words, the invention is directed to identifying “templates,” or sets of common visual objects such as photographs or logos, among a series of separate images, such as presentation slides. In short, the present invention identifies large graphical similarities between images such as shown in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 as filed. As such, an analysis is performed as described at paragraph [0011] as filed: bounding boxes such as A-F around different elements are identified, and these bounding boxes are, in the language of claim 1, compared between an input image and a reference image.

Further as described in paragraph [0011], “The bounding boxes are compared by attributes such as dimensions, location, image type (such as text, halftone image, photograph, etc.) and other features (such as color uniformity, black/white or color)....” This type of analysis, especially involving image type and color uniformity, are clearly distinct from the “word-shape” OCR analysis of Huttenlocher. Claim 1 has been amended above to recite comparison of these types of data, beyond the mere word-shape comparison of

Huttenlocher. Absent the recited analysis by image type (such as halftone or photograph) or color-related attributes, Huttenlocher anticipate cannot claim 1.

Claim 1 as amended includes the limitation of “considering an image type” as recited in claim 2 as originally filed (claim 2 has been cancelled). The rejection cites column 8, lines 21-26 against claim 2 as originally filed. However, the cited passage is concerned entirely with the “word token *shape*” via a “*shape* comparator 24,” and teaches nothing about an object **type**— that is, as mentioned in paragraph 0011, determining whether the object in a bounding box is text **or** a halftone or photograph. The cited passage, and Huttenlocher in general, just *assumes* text is being considered, while the claim recites a step of considering whether the object in a bounding box might be a halftone or photograph. For this reason, the cited passage cannot anticipate claim 1 as amended.

Claims 3-10, being dependent from claim 1 as amended, are thus deemed allowable. In the above Amendment, claim 10 has been changed to correct a typographical error.

The claims are therefore in condition for allowance.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-3811, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert Hutter, Reg. #32418/

Robert Hutter
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,418
Telephone (585) 423-3811

RH/gm